

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA  
BEAUFORT DIVISION

GAY WORTMAN,	)	
	)	
Plaintiff,	)	
	)	
vs.	)	Case No. 9:13-cv-01480-TLW
	)	
CAROLYN W. COLVIN,	)	
COMMISSIONER OF SOCIAL	)	
SECURITY ADMINISTRATION,	)	
	)	
Defendant.	)	
<hr style="width: 40%; margin-left: 0;"/>	)	

**ORDER**

Plaintiff Gay Wortman brought this action pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 405(g), to obtain judicial review of the Commissioner of the Social Security Administration’s (“Defendant”) final decision denying her claim for disability insurance benefits. This matter is before the Court for review of the Report and Recommendation (“the Report”) filed by United States Magistrate Bristow Marchant, to whom this case was assigned pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) and Local Civil Rule 73.02(B)(2)(a), (D.S.C.). In the Report, the Magistrate Judge recommends that this Court affirm Defendant’s decision. (Doc. #26). Objections were due on June 26, 2014. Plaintiff has filed no objections.

The Court is charged with conducting a de novo review of any portion of the Report to which a specific objection is registered, and may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the recommendations contained therein. 28 U.S.C. § 636. However, in the absence of objections to the Report, the Court is not required to give any explanation for adopting the Magistrate Judge’s recommendation. See Camby v. Davis, 718 F.2d 198, 200 (4th Cir. 1983). In such a case, “a district court need not conduct a de novo review, but instead must ‘only satisfy itself that

there is no clear error on the face of the record in order to accept the recommendation.’’  
Diamond v. Colonial Life & Accident Ins. Co., 416 F.3d 310, 315 (4th Cir. 2005) (quoting Fed.  
R. Civ. P. 72 advisory committee’s note). Furthermore, a party’s failure to file specific written  
objections to the Report waives the right to appellate review of that claim. See id. at 315-16.

The Court has carefully reviewed the Report. Having found no clear error on the face of  
the record, it is hereby **ORDERED** that the Magistrate Judge’s Report and Recommendation  
(Doc. #26) is **ACCEPTED**. For the reasons articulated by the Magistrate Judge, the  
Commissioner’s decision is **AFFIRMED**.

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

s/ Terry L. Wooten  
Terry L. Wooten  
Chief United States District Judge

August 22, 2014  
Columbia, South Carolina